CONTRADICTIONS AND OMISSIONS CONTAINED IN THE OCD PAPER

1. (p. 1, para 2) Index files started in April, 1948. --- OO-B reports and certain unclassified documents sent to the pool were fully coded and <u>abstracted</u> beginning in April 1948, but fax-cards were not prepared until installation of the "batch" procedure in October 1948.

2. (p. 2, para. 3) OCD is not capable of abstracting, but has produced over 6,000 abstracts. (p. 6)

3. (p. 3, para. 4) An artifical separation of abstract and index files is made, although indication is given that they are one intellofax file. (p. 8; p. 22.)

4. (p. 14, para 16) The classification scheme is stated to be adequate, yet a long discussion is included as to why it is not adequate in one particular instance. (pp. 29-30)

5. (p. 19) No mention is made that OCD achieved currency on indexing daily receipt of documents through procedures designed and installed by the Management Staff, i.e., the "batch" procedure.

6. (p. 22) Library, clearly, should not prepare specialized abstracts, "such work must be done by the specialists in the subject matter," yet, on p. 21 indication is given that Library will index all documents. If they can't abstract, how can they index?

7. (p. 28, para. 34) Administrative Officer, OSI suggested that OSI type its own mats. Management Officer concurred.

8. (p. 28) Training typists to type on mats is difficult, yet under Management Staff guidance during installation of the "batch" procedure, OCD typists were fully trained within one week.

9. (p. 28) Specialists neglect to specify general codes. If the classification scheme is adequate, it should permit general subject pulling from specific entries. Also, (p. 2, para. 3) the problem of providing too much information through too general coding is set forth.

10. (p. 29, top) Abstracts will be of value only to specialists who prepare them. Who else is interested? Like specialists think alike, not as an outsider.

11. (p. 2, para. 3) The large number of entries listed in answer to specific requests could stem from poor indexing by OCD.

12. (p. 13, para. 14) It is the considered opinion of OCD that the number of researchers create the number of code classifications required for proper indexing. This opinion is in the main in error as research personnel belonging to family groups all have fields of common concern., i.e., medical personnel world-wide utilize an international method of coding and classification.

13. No mention is made that coding and abstracting by substantive divisions will bring into the agency file, materials now being withheld from OCD.

14. No mention is made of who should perform abstracting and coding necessary to maintenance of industrial and biographic files. It can be assumed that OCD feels they should continue with these activities. Management Staff questions the technical ability of OCD to perform this service.